

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

+18479057113

T-383 P.01/20 F-931

MAY 16 2006

OFFICIAL

CARDINAL LAW GROUP

1603 Orrington Avenue/Suite 2000
Evanston, Illinois 60201
Telephone 847 - 905 - 7111
Facsimile 847 - 905 - 7113

Date: MAY 16, 2005

To: EXAMINER JACOBS, LASHONDA T.
U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Fax #: (571) 273-8300

From: FRANK C. NICHOLAS
Phone #: (847) 424-2521

Client/Matter No.: AUS920010540US1 (9000/51)

of Pages: 20

(including cover sheet)

IF YOU HAVE ANY PROBLEMS RECEIVING THIS MESSAGE, PLEASE CALL 847/905-7111, Ext. 112 AND ASK FOR JENNIFER CRUZ.

THIS MESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY TO WHICH IT IS ADDRESSED. IT MAY CONTAIN PRIVILEGED, CONFIDENTIAL, ATTORNEY WORK PRODUCT, OR TRADE SECRET INFORMATION WHICH IS EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE UNDER APPLICABLE LAWS. IF YOU ARE NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, OR AN EMPLOYEE OR AGENT RESPONSIBLE FOR DELIVERING THE MESSAGE TO THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION, OR COPYING OF THIS MESSAGE IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS MESSAGE IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY BY TELEPHONE AND RETURN THE ORIGINAL MESSAGE (AND ALL COPIES) TO US BY MAIL AT THE ABOVE ADDRESS. WE WILL REIMBURSE YOU FOR POSTAGE.

MAY 16 2006



PTO/SB/01 (12-97) Approved for use through 5-20-00. Filed 05-11-01. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Under the Paper Reduction Act of 1995, no person is required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM <i>(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)</i>	Attorney Docket No	AUS920010540US1 (9000/51)
	Application Number	09/935,396
	Filing Date	AUGUST 23, 2001
	First Named Inventor	CARL P. GUSLER
	Group Art Unit	2157
	Examiner	JACOBS, LASHONDA T

ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Amendment <input type="checkbox"/> After Final <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter <input type="checkbox"/> One-Month Petition for Extension of Time Request (dup) <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement, PTO-1449 <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application	<input type="checkbox"/> Assignment Papers <input type="checkbox"/> Drawing Sheets <input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to Group <input type="checkbox"/> Petition Routing Slip (PTO/SB/69) and Accompanying Petition <input type="checkbox"/> To Convert a Provisional Application <input type="checkbox"/> Change of Correspondence Address <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer <input type="checkbox"/> Small Entity Statement <input type="checkbox"/> Request of Refund	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal Brief <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information <input type="checkbox"/> Post Card Receipt <input type="checkbox"/> Additional Enclosure(s) (please identify below) <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. <u>09-0447</u> (IBM CORPORATION). A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I hereby petition under 37 CFR § 1.136(a) for any extension of time required to ensure that this paper is timely filed. Please charge any associated fees which have not otherwise been paid to Deposit Account No. <u>09-0447</u> (IBM CORPORATION). A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.		

CALCULATION OF FEE

					Small Entity		or		Large Entity	
	Claims After Amendment		Highest No Previously Paid For	Present Extra	Rate	Add'l Fee		Rate	Add'l Fee	
Total		Minus		0	x \$25=	0		x \$50=		
Indep.		Minus		0	x \$100=	0		x \$200=		
First Presentation of Multiple Dep. Claim					+ \$180=	—		+ \$360=		
					total add'l fee	\$ 0		total add'l fee	\$ 0	

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT			
Firm or Individual name	FRANK C. NICHOLAS Registration No. 33,983 CARDINAL LAW GROUP 1603 Orrington Avenue, Suite 2000 Evanston, IL 60201		
Signature		Date	May 16 2006
CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE			
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to (571) 273-8300 to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on this date: <u>May 16, 2006</u>			
Signature	 FRANK C. NICHOLAS (33,983)	Date:	May 16 2006

MAY 16 2006



PTO-852 (11-07) Approved for use through 8/30/06. Only PTO-852-0001 Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Under the Paper Reduction Act of 1992, no part of this document is required to be reproduced or stored in a retrieval system unless it contains a valid Check Control Number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM <i>(to be used for all correspondence after final filing)</i>	Attorney Docket No	AUS920010540US1 (9000/51)
	Application Number	09/835,396
	Filing Date	AUGUST 23, 2001
	First Named Inventor	CARL P. GUSLER
	Group Art Unit	2157
	Examiner	JACOBS, LASHONDA T.

ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Amendment <input type="checkbox"/> After Final <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter <input type="checkbox"/> One-Month Petition for Extension of Time Request (dup) <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement, PTO-1449 <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application	<input type="checkbox"/> Assignment Papers <input type="checkbox"/> Drawing Sheets <input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to Group <input type="checkbox"/> Petition Routing Slip (PTO/SB/69) and Accompanying Petition <input type="checkbox"/> To Convert a Provisional Application <input type="checkbox"/> Change of Correspondence Address <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer <input type="checkbox"/> Small Entity Statement <input type="checkbox"/> Request of Refund	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal Brief <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information <input type="checkbox"/> Post Card Receipt <input type="checkbox"/> Additional Enclosure(s) (please identify below): <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 20px; width: 100%;"></div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 20px; width: 100%;"></div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 20px; width: 100%;"></div>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. <u>09-0447</u> (IBM CORPORATION). A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I hereby petition under 37 CFR § 1.136(a) for any extension of time required to ensure that this paper is timely filed. Please charge any associated fees which have not otherwise been paid to Deposit Account No. <u>09-0447</u> (IBM CORPORATION). A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.		

CALCULATION OF FEE


				Small Entity		or		Large Entity	
	Claims After Amendment		Highest No. Previously Paid For	Present Extra	Rate	Add'l Fee		Rate	Add'l Fee
Total		Minus		0	x \$25=	0		x \$50=	
Insep.		Minus		0	x \$100=	0		x \$200=	
First Presentation of Multiple Dep. Claim					+ \$180=	—		+ \$360=	
					total add'l fee			total add'l fee	
					\$ 0			\$ 0	

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT			
Firm or Individual name	FRANK C. NICHOLAS Registration No. 33,883 CARDINAL LAW GROUP 1603 Orrington Avenue, Suite 2000 Evanston, IL 60201		
Signature		Date	May 16, 2006
CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE			
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to (571) 273-8300 to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on this date:			May 16, 2006
Signature	 FRANK C. NICHOLAS (33,883)	Date:	May 16, 2006

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 16 2006

Certificate of Facsimile
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being
transmitted by facsimile to (371) 273-8300 to the U.S.
Patent and Trademark Office May 16, 2006
(Date of Transmission)

FRANK C. NICHOLAS (33 983)
Name of applicant, assignee or registered representative

Signature
May 16, 2006
Date of Signature

PATENT
Case No. AUS920010540US1
(9000/51)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re patent application of:)	
)	
CARL P. GUSLER, ET AL.)	Examiner: JACOBS, L. T.
)	
Serial No.: 09/935,396)	
)	Group Art Unit: 2157
Filed: AUGUST 23, 2001)	
)	
Title: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR)	Conf. No.: 9829
AUTOMATED PROJECT)	
ACCOUNTABILITY)	

APPEAL BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Briefs - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Appellants respectfully present their appeal brief as follows:

May 16, 2006
Case No.: AUS920010540US1 (9000/51)
Serial No.: 09/935,396
Filed: Aug. 23, 2001
Page 2 of 17

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Real Party In Interest	3
2.	Related Appeals And Interferences	4
3.	Status Of Claims	5
4.	Status Of Amendments	6
5.	Summary Of Claimed Subject Matter.	7
6.	Grounds Of Rejection To Be Reviewed On Appeal	8
7.	Arguments	9
8.	Summary	11
	Claims Appendix	12
	Evidence Appendix	17
	Related Proceedings Appendix	17

March 29, 2006
Case No.: AUS920010540US1 (9000/51)
Serial No.: 09/935,396
Filed: Aug. 23, 2001
Page 3 of 17

1. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest is Assignee INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS
MACHINES CORPORATION, by virtue of an assignment executed by the inventors.

March 29, 2006
Case No.: AUS920010540US1 (9000/51)
Serial No.: 09/935,396
Filed: Aug. 23, 2001
Page 4 of 17

2. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Appellants and the undersigned attorneys are not aware of any appeals or any interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or having a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

March 29, 2006
Case No.: AUS920010540US1 (9000/51)
Serial No.: 09/935,396
Filed: Aug. 23, 2001
Page 5 of 17

3. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-22 were rejected as anticipated by United States Patent Application
Publication 2001/0032105 to Frye ("Frye").

Claims 1-22 are the claims on appeal. *See*, Appendix.

March 29, 2006

Case No.: AUS920010540US1 (9000/51)

Serial No.: 09/935,396

Filed: Aug. 23, 2001

Page 6 of 17

4. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No amendments have been made or entered.

March 29, 2006
 Case No.: AUS920010540US1 (9000/51)
 Serial No.: 09/935,396
 Filed: Aug. 23, 2001
 Page 7 of 17

5. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

In this summary of claimed subject matter, all citations are to the specification of United States Patent Application 09/935,396 filed on August 23, 2001. Further, all citations are illustrative only and support for the cited element may be found elsewhere in the specification.

The invention describes a method for automated project accountability. The method includes determining 220 at least one decision maker of a project preparation and determining 230 a readiness category for the decision maker. The method further includes providing 230 a readiness category rating for the readiness category; determining 240 a decision process for the readiness category and readiness category rating, and conducting 260 a project assessment as a function of the decision process. Additionally, the method includes determining 270 a project readiness as a function of the project assessments. See, e.g., FIG. 2 (below).




FIG. 2

In one embodiment of the invention, the method further includes assigning vote weighting 240 to the decision maker (p. 7, lines 11-18).

March 29, 2006
Case No.: AUS920010540US1 (9000/51)
Serial No.: 09/935,396
Filed: Aug. 23, 2001
Page 8 of 17

6. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Claims 1-22 were rejected as anticipated by Frye.

March 29, 2006
Case No.: AUS920010540US1 (9000/51)
Serial No.: 09/935,396
Filed: Aug. 23, 2001
Page 9 of 17

7. ARGUMENTS

To warrant this §102(e) anticipation rejection of pending claims 1-22, *Frye* must show each and every limitation of claims 1-22 in as complete detail as is contained in claims 1-22. *See*, MPEP §2131. "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). *See also* MPEP §2131.02. "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Frye does not disclose and teaches away from the claimed terms "determining a readiness category for the decision maker" and "providing a readiness category rating for the readiness category" as recited in claims 1, 9, and 16.

The Examiner's citation to ¶40 is misplaced, as that section only discusses determining a status of various pieces of information received into a computer system and receiving a second stage approver's decision as to whether to advance the program into stage 3. *See* ¶40, below. *Frye* simply does not disclose determining a readiness category for the decision maker or providing a readiness category rating for the readiness category.

[0048] Returning now to FIG. 5, once all required assessment and initiation milestone information as well as any submitted checklist information has been received into the computer system, a second stage approval workflow is initiated by the developer in step 510, wherein a second stage approver is electronically notified about the status of the various pieces of information received into the computer system in the second stage. In step 512, the system receives a second stage approver's request to review the received second stage assessment and initiation information and, in step 514, the system receives the second stage approver's decision as to whether or not to advance the program into stage 3. Preferably, the request to review the received second stage assessment and initiation information is substantially similar to the initial user request to submit the information. That is, the second stage approver simply enters the system like any other user and reviews any or all of the second stage assessment and initiation information contained in the system. If the system receives the second stage approver's decision to reject advancement to stage 3, the system, in step 516, notifies the project owner of this decision. However, if the system receives the second stage approver's decision to

advance the program to stage 3, the system proceeds to step 800 of FIG. 8, set forth in detail below.

March 29, 2006
Case No.: AUS920010540US1 (9000/51)
Serial No.: 09/935,396
Filed: Aug. 23, 2001
Page 10 of 17

The claims require that the readiness category is for the *decision maker*, rather than for the *project* itself. Thus, actual progress of the project is not addressed in this particular claim limitation - the readiness category is for the decision maker.

With respect to claims 2, 10, and 17, *Frye* does not disclose "assigning vote weighing to the decision maker." The Examiner's citation to ¶31 is misplaced, as *Frye* does not disclose the claimed element. At most, *Frye* discloses a tollgate that is a checkpoint in a project's progression involving a meeting between various members of a cross-functional team. At most, *Frye* implies that a vote is taken, but does not disclose assigning vote weighting to the decision maker.

[0031] As defined briefly above, a tollgate is generally a checkpoint in a project's progression and involves a meeting between the various members of the cross-functional team. During the meeting, which is preferably held in an online environment, the team members discuss the current state of the project and each member renders an opinion as to whether or not the tollgate should be passed. In a preferred embodiment, a single individual is then charged with the task of reviewing all materials and comments and making a decision regarding the present tollgate. If it is determined that the program shows sufficient likelihood for success, the tollgate is passed in step 412 and the project proceeds to the third stage. However, if the second tollgate is not passed, the project is either re-evaluated or canceled in step 414.

Further, claims 2-8, 10-15, and 17-22 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1, 9, or 16 respectively, and are therefore patentable over the prior art for at least the same reasons.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-22 under U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Frye* is therefore respectfully requested.

March 29, 2006
Case No.: AUS920010540US1 (9000/51)
Serial No.: 09/935,396
Filed: Aug. 23, 2001
Page 11 of 17


SUMMARY

Appellants respectfully submit that claims 1-22 fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§101, 102, 103 and 112. In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration and early passage to issue of the present application is respectfully requested.

Dated: May 16, 2006

Respectfully submitted,
CARL P. GUSLER, et al.

CARDINAL LAW GROUP
1603 Orrington Avenue, Suite 2000
Evanston, IL 60201
(847) 905-7111


FRANK C. NICHOLAS,
Registration No. (33,983)
Attorney for Appellants

March 29, 2006
Case No.: AUS920010540US1 (9000/51)
Serial No.: 09/935,396
Filed: Aug. 23, 2001
Page 12 of 17

10. APPENDIX

1. A method for automated project accountability comprising:
determining at least one decision maker of a project preparation;
determining a readiness category for the decision maker;
providing a readiness category rating for the readiness category;
determining a decision process for the readiness category and readiness
category rating;
conducting a project assessment as a function of the decision process; and
determining a project readiness as a function of the project assessments.
2. The method of claim 1 further comprising:
assigning vote weighting to the decision maker.
3. The method of claim 1 further comprising:
changing a project management application graphical interface, as a func-
tion of the project assessment.
4. The method of claim 1 further comprising:
assigning a time limit in association with the project assessment and the
project readiness.
5. The method of claim 1 further comprising:
providing a collaborative environment for the decision maker.
6. The method of claim 5 wherein the collaborative discussion mechanism
is invoked for determining the readiness category, determining the decision process,
conducting the project assessment, and determining the project readiness.

March 29, 2006
Case No.: AUS920010540US1 (9000/51)
Serial No.: 09/935,396
Filed: Aug. 23, 2001
Page 13 of 17

7. The method of claim 1 wherein the determination of at least one decision maker further comprises:

- providing project information from a project creator;
- accessing a data repository;
- retrieving a list from the data repository;
- selecting a project decision maker as a function of the project information

and list; and

- selecting at least one contributing decision maker as a function of the project information, list, and project decision maker.

8. The method of claim 7 further comprising:

- providing technical information from the project creator; and
- providing security information from the project creator.

9. A system for automated project accountability comprising:

- means for determining at least one decision maker of a project preparation;

- means for determining a readiness category for the decision maker;
- means for providing a readiness category rating for the readiness category;

gory;

- means for determining a decision process for the readiness category and readiness category rating;

- means for conducting a project assessment as a function of the decision process; and

- means for determining a project readiness as a function of the project assessments.

March 29, 2006
Case No.: AUS920010540US1 (9000/51)
Serial No.: 09/935,396
Filed: Aug. 23, 2001
Page 14 of 17

10. The system of claim 9 further comprising:
means for assigning vote weighting to the decision maker.
11. The system of claim 9 further comprising:
means for changing a project management application graphical interface,
as a function of the project assessment.
12. The system of claim 9 further comprising:
means for assigning a time limit in association with the project assessment and the project readiness.
13. The system of claim 9 further comprising:
means for providing a collaborative environment for the decision maker.
14. The system of claim 9 wherein the means for determination of at least one decision maker further comprises:
means for providing project information from a project creator;
means for accessing a data repository;
means for retrieving a list from the data repository;
means for selecting a project decision maker as a function of the project information and list; and
means for selecting at least one contributing decision maker as a function of the project information, list, and project decision maker.
15. The system of claim 14 further comprising:
means for providing technical information from the project creator; and
means for providing security information from the project creator.

March 29, 2006
Case No.: AUS920010540US1 (9000/51)
Serial No.: 09/935,396
Filed: Aug. 23, 2001
Page 15 of 17

16. A computer readable medium storing a computer program comprising:
computer readable code for determining at least one decision maker of a project preparation;
computer readable code for determining a readiness category for the decision maker;
computer readable code for providing a readiness category rating for the readiness category;
computer readable code for determining a decision process for the readiness category and readiness category rating;
computer readable code for conducting a project assessment as a function of the decision process; and
computer readable code for determining a project readiness as a function of the project assessments.

17. The computer readable medium of claim 16 further comprising:
means for assigning vote weighting to the decision maker.

18. The computer readable medium of claim 16 further comprising:
computer readable code for changing a project management application graphical interface, as a function of the project assessment.

19. The computer readable medium of claim 16 further comprising:
computer readable code for assigning a time limit in association with the project assessment and the project readiness.

March 29, 2006
Case No.: AUS920010540US1 (9000/51)
Serial No.: 09/935,396
Filed: Aug. 23, 2001
Page 16 of 17

20. The computer readable medium of claim 16 further comprising:
computer readable code for providing a collaborative environment for the
decision maker.

21. The computer readable medium of claim 16 wherein the computer read-
able code for determination of at least one decision maker further comprises:
computer readable code for providing project information from a project
creator;
computer readable code for accessing a data repository;
computer readable code for retrieving a list from the data repository;
computer readable code for selecting a project decision maker as a func-
tion of the project information and list; and
computer readable code for selecting at least one contributing decision
maker as a function of the project information, list, and project decision maker.

22. The computer readable medium of claim 21 further comprising:
computer readable code for providing technical information from the pro-
ject creator; and
computer readable code for providing security information from the pro-
ject creator.

March 29, 2006
Case No.: AUS920010540US1 (9000/51)
Serial No.: 09/935,396
Filed: Aug. 23, 2001
Page 17 of 17

Evidence Appendix

None

Related Proceedings Appendix

None.